



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/492,437	01/27/2000	Hatim Yousef Amro	AT9-99-483	9872

7590 11/05/2002

Duke W Yee  
Carstens Yee & Cahoon LLP  
P O Box 802334  
Dallas, TX 75380

EXAMINER
----------

NGUYEN, PHUOC H

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2143

DATE MAILED: 11/05/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

09/492,437

Applicant(s)

AMRO ET AL.

Examiner

Phuoc H. Nguyen

Art Unit

2143

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on \_\_\_\_.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-28 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-28 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120**

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 2.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_.

**DETAILED ACTION**

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) do not apply to the examination of this application as the application being examined was not (1) filed on or after November 29, 2000, or (2) voluntarily published under 35 U.S.C. 122(b). Therefore, this application is examined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

2. Claims 1-3,5-7,9-28 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Lou et al. U.S. Patent 6,216,158.

3. Referring to claims Referring to claims 1,11,15,19,23,25, and 27, Lou reference discloses a hub (fig. 1 and col. 11, lines 62-64); and a plurality of computing devices in physical proximity with the hub (fig. 1); wherein each of the plurality of computing devices communicates with the hub via a wireless connection (col. 5, lines 57-65); the hub receives and retransmits requested documents between selected computing devices (col. 3, 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph); each of the plurality of computing devices translates each requested document into a system independent language prior to transmitting the requested document to the hub (col. 5, lines 9-21); and each of the plurality of computing devices translates each received document from the hub (col. 6, lines 53-57).

Art Unit: 2143

4. Referring to claims 2,14,18, and 22, Lou reference discloses the system independent language is a Java based language (col. 2, lines 53-58).

5. Referring to claims 3,13,17, and 21, Lou reference discloses the system independent language is an extensible markup language (col. 2, lines 41-47).

6. Referring to claims 5-7, and 10, Lou reference discloses wherein at least one of the plurality of computing devices is a personal digital assistant (col. 1, lines 13-16); wherein at least one of the plurality of computing devices is a laptop computer (col. 1, lines 23-25); wherein at least one of the plurality of computing devices is portable (col. 1, lines 13-16); and transmissions between each of the plurality of computing devices and the hub are radio frequency transmissions (fig. 1, palm sized computer 100).

7. Referring to claims 9,12,16, 20,24,26, and 28, Lou reference discloses transmissions between each of the plurality of computing devices and the hub are infrared transmissions (col. 5, lines 57-65); the strength of the wireless communication signal is such that only devices in close proximity with each other may receive the signal, thus ensuring that only authorized recipients receive information conveyed via the wireless communication signal (col. 5, lines 57-65). It should be understand that when you use the infrared transmission rate is roughly the same transmission rates as traditional parallel ports. The only restrictions on their use is that the two devices must be within a few feet of each other and there must be a clear line of sight between them.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

8. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

Art Unit: 2143

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

9. Claim 4 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lou in view of Sopko U.S. Patent 6,003,068.

Lou reference discloses a hub; however, Lou reference does not teach that the hub is portable.

Sopko reference discloses the hub is portable (col. 2, lines 12-18).

It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to incorporate Sopko's teaching into Lou's method to use the portable hub, because it is not only small and lightweight it is also make it easier to carry from places to places.

10. Claims 8, and 10 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lou in view of Koperda U.S. Patent 5,790,806.

11. Referring to claim 8, Lou reference discloses the hub receives and retransmits requested documents between selected computing devices; however, Lou reference fails to teach us that the transmissions between each of the plurality of computing devices and the hub are encrypted.

Koperda reference discloses transmissions between each of the plurality of computing devices and the hub are encrypted (col. 4, lines 37-39).

It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to incorporate Koperda's teaching into Lou's method to add the encryption and decryption to the data, because we want to make the data more secure during the transmission.

Art Unit: 2143

***Conclusion***

12. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

**Beswick et al. U.S. Patent 6,462,616** discloses embedded phonetic support and its play button in a contacts database

**Lindgren et al. U.S. Patent 6,411,632** discloses network hub for interconnecting a wireless office environment with a public cellular telephone network

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Phuoc H. Nguyen whose telephone number is 703-305-5315. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon -Thu ( 7AM-4:30PM ) and off every other Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David A Wiley can be reached on 703-308-5221. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-746-7239 for regular communications and 703-746-7238 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-3900.

Phuoc H. Nguyen  
Examiner  
Art Unit 2143

\*\*\*

October 28, 2002

  
**DAVID WILEY**  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100